The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., MAY 12, 1904. No. 19.

A NEW BASIS OF THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS AND OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE Rev. Dr. Thomas J. Shahan, in his 'Beginnings of Christianity,' a book to which we have already once adverted, endeavors not only to make the apocryphal legend of St. Thecla appear historic, but to establish a brand new basis for the communion of Saints and of Christianity itself. We quote:

"*Memoria bene redditae vitae sempiterna.* There is a pure, serene, altruism in certain lives whose laborious course has been kept in steady orientation to truth and beauty and goodness. Nor do we need to hear a George Eliot preach:

'The choir invisible
Of those immortal dead who live again
In lives made better by their presence,
And make undying music in the world,
Breathing us beauteous order that controls
With growing sway the growing life of man.'

"Between the true doctrines of Catholicism and the natural aspirations and convictions of the human heart there is just such a minute, accurate, and Catholic congruism as we should expect from the divine Founder of that religion. Beneficent lives, however short, never melt into the general void, but *shed forever a sweet aroma within the circle of their rememberers. This is the basis of the Communion of Saints,**) and it is broad enough to justify not only the interest of the blessed ones in our lives and their ever-present influence, but also the unbroken operation in human affairs of all choice spirits who have ever uplifted humanity or straightened out its tortuous pathway. So Dante saw (Inf. IV, 116-120) on the greensward outside the air that trembled over the

fatal abyss, the pagan just, whose writings and great deeds yet have power to sway the souls of men:

'In luogo aperto, luminoso, ed alto,
Si che veder si potean tutti e quanti,
Colà diritto, sopra il verde smalto
Mi fur mostrati gli spiriti magni,
Che del vederli in me stesso n'esalto.'

"Homer and Socrates, and Plato and Aristotle, the martyrs and the doctors, and the great pilot bishops in the Wandering of the Nations; the liberty and justice-loving popes and priests of the Middle Ages; the builders of Cologne and the Sainte Chapelle, and the founders of the Italian republics; Dante, and Columbus, and Joan of Arc; Milton and Shakespeare—all these live on forever in the hearts of men, in a sort of earthly apotheosis—household divinities that shield our spiritual hearths from a hundred devastating philosophies and corrupting examples and preach in season and out, *the lessons of patience, unselfishness, mutual helpfulness, enduring enthusiasm and high idealism—in other words, that pure natural religion which is the basis of Christianity*, and which has been so long saturated with the light of the latter that in its upper strata it is scarcely distinguishable from the revelation of Jesus."—Shahan, 'The Beginnings of Christianity,' pages 437-439. (Italics ours.)

Accordingly, the basis of the communion of Saints has shifted from the fact of the redemption and our adoption as children of God in and through the Divine Saviour, to "the sweet aroma which beneficent lives shed forever within the circle of their remembers." That is indeed a "broad enough" basis. It gives us such new saints as Homer, Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, "the founders of the Italian republics" (not monarchies—these are relegated to sheol in this republican age!), Dante, Milton, and Shakespeare.

With the basis of the communion of Saints there has also shifted the basis of Christianity itself, which used to be in the nature of man and his necessary relation to his Creator, but is now found in the lessons preached by the new "saints" afore-mentioned, "of patience, unselfishness, mutual helpfulness" (all realized in Milton advocating divorce, Aristotle and Plato teaching slavery, infanticide, etc.) "enduring enthusiasm and high idealism."*)

Dr. Shahan seems to be in complete agreement with another recent writer, according to whom the communion of Saints means "sympathy with all good people in all times and in all religions;

---

*) These virtues are small potatoes when compared to the four cardinal virtues: justice fortitude, prudence, and temperance; yet even of these Innocent III. wrote that, "unless dyed in the blood of Christ, they usurp the name of virtue in vain, and do not lead to the true glory of beatitude." (Lib. 1, Mysterior. Missae, cap. 63.)

and Christianity is little more than a sympathetic attitude to the prophets and the sages of old and the great minds of all times."*) Like our reverend confrère of the *Western Watchman*, "we don't see why the list should not include Martin Luther, Voltaire, and Ingersoll."

But where does the Church come in?

Well, she is a meeting place, a sort of grove where these kindred spirits can assemble for communion; and we should be glad to have so pleasant a casino in which to convene for mutual edification. Or, to use the ironical definition of a recent writer, "she is a sort of repair shop where damaged theological weapons can be reshaped and sharpened, a storehouse of old reference where the units of soul measurements are preserved."

To apply to Dr. Shahan the criticism which so liberal a theologian as Rev. D. S. Phelan of the *Western Watchman* recently (Feb. 7th) pronounced upon another stickler for theological novelties: "We do not know what there is in the scholastic atmosphere of" the Catholic University "that makes for theological craziness. Catholics there ape at Oxford culture and Cambridge cant, and neglect the weightier things of the law, solid, rudimentary theological training. Mivart said that every new discovery in science was attended by the dying groans of a strangled Catholic theologian. How false that is! The world knows that every new discovery in science, including that of radium, is attended by the spontaneous and simultaneous explosion of thousands of over-inflated scientific balloons." We would ask, who is responsible for the publication of such trash?.... Has a professor of the Catholic University "more right to flood the world with putrid theological fish than diocesan priests? Abbé Loisy was brought to time by his bishop in very short order. Is there no way of stopping Father" Shahan? "God help us! There was a time when Catholic churchmen were remarkable for great ideas; now many of them are noted only for big words."

*) Western Watchman, Feb. 7th, 1904: "The Vagaries of Father Tyrrell."

* * *

——Can a Catholic be a Socialist? Rev. Dr. Lambert sums up his negative answer to this question succinctly thus: "Every ism must be judged by its principles. If these be false, the ism is false. Socialism, according to its authoritative exponents, rests on a basis of materialism and atheism; it is therefore materialistic and atheistic, and is the foe of the Church and the family. Such being the case, need you ask, 'Can a Catholic be a Socialist and remain in the Church?'"

IS THE SINGLE TAX THEORY AN OPEN QUESTION?

V.

A Single Tax Encyclical.

By the comparison which we have made of Henry George's doctrine on land ownership with that of Leo XIII., their diametrical opposition and absolute incompatibility has, we believe, been made evident to all who have eyes to see and a mind to understand. What Mr. George asserts, Pope Leo denies; what Pope Leo maintains, Mr. George rejects. A doubt about this is as impossible as one about the opposition between just and unjust, between yes and no.

Yet we can not resist the temptation to adduce another proof for our assertion. It is the curious document which may aptly be called a Single Tax Encyclical. It has been entitled by its author: "The Condition of Labor. An Open Letter to Pope Leo XIII."

In it Mr. George undertakes no less a task than, by setting forth "the grounds of his belief," by refuting all the arguments advanced by the Pope in favor of private land ownership, and by showing the radical defects of the proposed remedies against social evils, to disabuse him of his "one false and fatal assumption," the justice of individual land ownership. If in this attempt he should be unsuccessful, he is nevertheless confident that the Pope's Encyclical, which "will be seen by those who carefully analyze it to be directed not against Socialism,.... but against what we in the United States call the Single Tax," will at least bring this theory into discussion. But discussion is, according to Henry George, all that it needs in order to be finally victorious; "for it is of the nature of truth always to prevail over error where discussion goes on."

Since we are at present concerned, not with examining Mr. George's arguments, but only with ascertaining the relation of his doctrine to that of the "Rerum Novarum," we shall reproduce only those passages of his "Open Letter" which directly bring out this relation. The unequivocal and pointed language of the author will convince the reader how clearly and correctly he had grasped the drift and import of the first part of Leo's great Encyclical.

"To Pope Leo XIII. Your Holiness: I have read with care your Encyclical letter on the condition of labor, addressed, through the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops of your faith, to the Christian World. Since its most strikingly pronounced condemnations are directed against a theory that we who

hold it know to be deserving of your support, I ask permission to lay before your Holiness the grounds of our belief, and to set forth some considerations which you have unfortunately overlooked. The momentous seriousness of the facts you refer to, the poverty, suffering and seething discontent that pervade the Christian world, the danger that passion may lead ignorance in a blind struggle against social conditions rapidly becoming intolerable, are my justification.

. . . . . .

"Your Holiness will see from the explanation I have given that the reform we propose, like all true reforms, has both an ethical and an economic side.... To those who think as I do, the ethical is the more important side.... Hence we earnestly seek the judgment of religion. This is the tribunal of which your Holiness as the head of the largest body of Christians is the most august representative.

"It therefore behooves us to examine the reasons you urge in support of private property in land—if they be sound to accept them, and if they be not sound respectfully to point out to you wherein is the error.

"To your proposition that 'Our first and most fundamental principle when we undertake to alleviate the condition of the masses must be the inviolability of private property,' we would joyfully agree if we could only understand you to have in mind the moral element, and to mean rightful private property, as when you speak of marriage as ordained by God's authority we may understand an implied exclusion of improper marriages. Unfortunately, however, other expressions show that you mean private property in general and have expressly in mind private property in land. This confusion of thought, this non-distribution of terms, runs through your whole argument, leading you to conclusions so unwarranted by your premises as to be utterly repugnant to them, as when from the moral sanction of private property in the things produced by labor you infer something entirely different and utterly opposed, a similar right of property in the land created by God.

. . . . . .

"Your use, in so many passages of your Encyclical, of the inclusive term 'property' or 'private property,' of which in morals nothing can be either affirmed or denied, makes your meaning, if we take isolated sentences, in many places ambiguous. But reading it as a whole, there can be no doubt of your intention that private property in land shall be understood when you speak merely

of private property. With this interpretation, I find that the reasons you urge for private property in land are eight.

. . . . . .

"Believing that the social question is at bottom a religious question, we deem it of happy augury to the world that in your Encyclical the most influential of all religious teachers has directed attention to the condition of labor.

"But while we appreciate the many wholesome truths you utter, while we feel, as all must feel, that you are animated by a desire to help the suffering and oppressed, and to put an end to any idea that the Church is divorced from the aspiration for liberty and progress, yet it is painfully obvious to us that one fatal assumption hides from you the cause of the evils you see, and makes it impossible for you to propose any adequate remedy. This assumption is, that private property in land is of the same nature and has the same sanctions as private property in things produced by labor. In spite of its undeniable truths and its benevolent spirit, your Encyclical shows you to be involved in such difficulties as a physician called to examine one suffering from disease of the stomach would meet should he begin with the refusal to consider the stomach.

. . . . . .

"One false assumption prevents you from seeing the real cause and true significance of the facts that have prompted your Encyclical. And it fatally fetters you when you seek a remedy.

"You state that you approach the subject with confidence, yet in all that greater part of the Encyclical devoted to the remedy, while there is an abundance of moral reflections and injunctions, excellent in themselves but dead and meaningless as you apply them, the only definite practical proposals for the improvement of the condition of labor are:....

"These remedies so far as they go are Socialistic, and though the Encyclical is not without recognition of the individual character of man and of the priority of the individual and the family to the State, yet the whole tendency and spirit of its remedial suggestions lean unmistakably to Socialism—extremely moderate Socialism it is true; Socialism hampered and emasculated by a supreme respect for private possessions; yet Socialism still. But, although you frequently use the ambiguous term 'private property' when the context shows that you have in mind private property in land, the one thing clear on the surface and becoming clearer still with examination is that you insist that whatever else may be done. the private ownership of land shall be left untouched.

. . . . . .

"In the beginning of the Encyclical you declare that the responsibility of the apostolic office urges your Holiness to treat the question of the condition of labor 'expressly and at length in order that there may be no mistake as to the principles which truth and justice dictate for its settlement.' But, blinded by one false assumption, you do not see even fundamentals.

. . . . . .

"I have written this letter not alone for your Holiness, but for all whom I may hope it to reach. But in sending it to you personally, and in advance of publication, I trust that it may be by you personally read and weighed. In setting forth the grounds of our belief and in pointing out considerations which it seems to us you have unfortunately overlooked, I have written frankly, as was my duty on a matter of such momentous importance, and as I am sure you would have me write. But I trust I have done so without offence. For your office I have profound respect, for yourself personally the highest esteem. And while the views I have opposed seem to us erroneous and dangerous, we do not wish to be understood as in the slightest degree questioning either your sincerity or intelligence in adopting them. For they are views all but universally held by the professed religious teachers of Christendom, in all communions and creeds, and that have received the sanction of those looked to as the wise and learned. Under the conditions that have surrounded you, and under the pressure of so many high duties and responsibilities, culminating in those of your present exalted position, it is not to be expected that you should have hitherto thought to question them. But I trust that the considerations herein set forth may induce you to do so, and even if the burdens and cares that beset you shall now make impossible the careful consideration that should precede expression by one in your responsible position, I trust that what I have written may not be without use to others.

"And, as I have said, we are deeply grateful for your Encyclical. It is much that by so conspicuously calling attention to the condition of labor, you have recalled the fact forgotten by so many that the social evils and problems of our time directly and pressingly concern the Church. It is much that you should thus have placed the stamp of your disapproval on that impious doctrine which directly and by implication has been so long and so widely preached in the name of Christianity, that the sufferings of the poor are due to mysterious decrees of Providence, which men may lament, but can not alter. Your Encyclical will be seen by those who carefully analyze it to be directed not against Socialism, which in moderate form you favor, but against what we in the United

States call the Single Tax. Yet we have no solicitude for the truth save that it shall be brought into discussion, and we recognize in your Holiness' Encyclical a most efficient means of promoting discussion, and of promoting discussion along the lines that we deem of the greatest importance—the lines of morality and religion. In this you deserve the gratitude of all who would follow truth, for it is of the nature of truth always to prevail over error where discussion goes on.

"And the truth for which we stand has now made such progress in the minds of men, that it must be heard; that it can never be stifled; that it must go on conquering and to conquer....

"Forty years ago slavery seemed stronger in the United States than ever before....Yet forty years ago....slavery, as we may now see, was doomed.

"To-day a wider, deeper, more beneficent revolution is brooding, not over one country, but over the world. God's truth impels it, and forces mightier than He has ever before given to man urge it on....Where shall the dignitaries of the Church be in the struggle that is coming, nay that is already here? On the side of justice and liberty, or on the side of wrong and slavery? with the delivered when the timbrels shall sound again, or with the chariots and the horsemen that again shall be engulfed in the sea?

"As to the masses, there is little fear where they will be. Already, among those who hold it with religious fervor, the Single Tax counts great numbers of Catholics, many priests, secular and regular, and at least some bishops, while there is no communion or denomination of the many into which English speaking Christians are divided where its advocates are not to be found....

"Servant of the Servants of God! I call you by the strongest and sweetest of your titles. In your hands more than in those of any living man lies the power to say the word and make the sign that shall end an unnatural divorce, and marry again to religion all that is pure and high in social aspiration.

"Wishing for your Holiness the chiefest of all blessings, that you may know the truth and be freed by the truth; wishing for you the days and the strength that may enable you by the great service you may render to humanity to make your pontificate through all coming time most glorious; and with the profound respect due to your personal character and to your exalted office, I am, Yours sincerely,

New York, September 11th, 1891. HENRY GEORGE."

* * *

THE "LURKING MONOTHEISM" OF FREEMASONRY.

What we have said of Brahmanism, we must say equally of all the other forms of paganism, which have their initiations and ineffable name and mystic rites and esoteric doctrines, no matter what superstitions may befoul them or what gross polytheism they may spread among the masses. It is sufficient to touch the Masonic heart and call forth Masonic praise and merit Masonic study, no matter how many gods the religious form may actually have, if only we find each god in turn called the "Supreme Being." We shall then find monotheism "lurking in its depths." Polytheism will be only "incipient" or "apparent," and though the actual monotheists are the "select few" in the adyta of the temples, and millions are the real polytheists of every-day life, we shall find "a most ancient religion believed in by one-seventh of the world's population."

In what does thus this seventh of the world's population believe? In the one true God? Far from it. It believes in a religion which, even according to our author himself, contains the "basest superstitions." To what purpose then is it to quote numbers? Do numbers make truth? Does not Masonry itself hold that the "select few" alone are possessors of truth as against the immense multitude that wanders in error? What then has this "seventh of the world's population" to do in the present case, except by a dishonest trick, for it is nothing else, to seek to impress the unthinking reader with the majesty of numbers, as if these were witnesses to the universality of Masonry and its principles.

We are willing to grant the numbers, if desired; but they must be taken as they are, adherents of the "basest superstitions." The more that such numbers are multiplied, the worse for the cause of Masonry, and the better for our own. Such universality is not the universality of truth.

But what shall we say of this absurd system of a "lurking monotheism," which makes each one of a multitude of gods the Supreme Being in turn? Monotheism is not like a human monarchy, in which no matter how individuals may change, the essence of the government is kept, provided that but one individual at a time rule. Monotheism is the individuality of the divine nature which positively excludes the plurality of such nature. It does not admit of more or less god, for it is infinite and co-extensive with divinity. It can not, therefore, admit an order of gods in which one is supreme and others are subordinate. It can not admit a succession of deities occupying the divine throne, even if it call each in turn supreme. Monotheism, moreover, to be true, must not only hold the truth of the unity of the divine nature, but must

also revere and worship divinity where divinity really is. Just as in America it is not sufficient to admit in general that one man is president, if I make in turn a president of every man I meet, so it is not sufficient to believe in the oneness of the deity, if I make a god of that which is not God. It is not sufficient for a Chinaman to say, "I believe in one Supreme Deity," if he adds at the same time, "and this Joss before which I kneel, is the Supreme Deity"; or for the ancient Egyptian to say, "I believe in one supreme deity, and this cat, this dog, this potherb is the supreme deity." In the general proposition he would be right, but in the practical application be would be wrong; and it is the practical proposition that regulates life.

But I need not insist upon this with Masonry, for while in its language for the outer world it may seem to differ, in its inward practice it is in perfect accord. In its exoteric school it may indeed pretend to be satisfied with a belief in a deity, no matter what that deity may be; but this is only that its disciple may later enter its esoteric school and learn from its lips what "the true nature and essence of God" is; for it is this search after divine truth that constitutes the essential labor of the Mason. If he must search and labor, and all must search and labor, it is evident that on entering Masonry he is not in possession of divine truth, though without belief in some deity or other he would not be received. This mere generic belief in a deity, this absurd monotheism which exists only in adherance to this or that god at random, is therefore not sufficient for the esoteric Mason, since he enters Masonry in order to learn the true nature and essence of God. But he is already a believer in one Supreme Being. No matter. He is a Christian. No matter. He is a Catholic. It is all the same: he must learn from Masonry the true nature of the Supreme Being. He must worship its god. But its God is not the God of the Christians: Jesus Christ.

BOOK REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTES.

Socialism: The Nation of Fatherless Children. By David Goldstein. 8°, 374 pages. Paper 50 cts. Boston, The Union News League.

The title is odd; happily the contents are better. The author, formerly a Socialist himself, shows from first-hand sources that American Socialism stands for materialism in religion and anarchy in society. Its whole tendency, its *raison d'être*, is destruction, without one redeeming feature. The book deserves a wide circulation despite its poor literary make-up. The average working

man may never notice these shortcomings, but the educated reader would wish to see the book in better shape.

Indictment of Socialism. By the Rev. Marshall I. Boarman, S. J. 32°, 32 pages. 5 cts. The W. I. Feely Co., Chicago, Ill.

The contents of this booklet might be described as a condensation of Goldstein's bulky and uncouth volume in good literary form. He who has no time to read the larger work, should study this little one. One hundred copies are offered for $4, rather high for spreading broadcast the useful pamphlet, which is better adapted to warn others against Socialism, than to wean Socialists from their pernicious errors.

——In his interesting history of the 'Literature of the Louisiana Territory,' just published, Dr. Alexander N. De Menil throws some light on an incident in the literary career of Father Abram J. Ryan, "the poet-priest of the South." As many of our readers are doubtless aware, there has been quite a controversy over the authorship of the poem "The Conquered Banner," some attributing it to Father Ryan, others to Mrs. Anna Peyre Dinnies. After diligent investigation, Dr. De Menil found the facts to be as follows: "Mrs. Dinnies, in the thirties, adopted the nom-de-plume of 'Moina' (se *The Illinois Monthly Magazine*, Vandalia and Bloomington, Illinois); this name she used ever afterwards. In the sixties, Father Abram J. Ryan also used the pseudonym, not aware (I am perfectly satisfied) of Mrs. Dinnies' prior claim to it. 'The Conquered Banner' was published under the signature 'Moina.' The correspondence that took place between Mrs. Dinnies and Father Ryan was as to the use of the name 'Moina'—not as to the authorship of 'The Conquered Banner.' I can find no evidence that Mrs. Dinnies ever claimed the poem. Father Ryan graciously apologized and never after used the signature 'Moina.' The correspondence is in the possession of a lady who resides in Milwaukee." (De Menil, Literature of the Louisiana Territory, p. 114.)

——The new 'Thesaurus Linguae Latinae,' which is being published by the joint Academies of Sciences in Germany, and of which eleven parts, covering the greater portion of the letter A, have appeared, is having a very encouraging sale. The *Kölnische Zeitung* reports that there are more than 1,500 subscribers, an exceptionally large number of copies going to foreign parts, especially to North America. (Among the American subscribers to this monumental work, we are proud to say, is our humble REVIEW.) This success is very gratifying to the German Academies, whose finances are severely taxed by the expenses of this immense undertaking. It is announced that completion can not be expected short of twelve years.

MINOR TOPICS.

An Objection Against Free Parochial Schools.—Rev. Father A. Fretz, pastor of the Church of the Holy Ghost at South Bethlehem, Pa., writes to THE REVIEW:

"It seems to me that in the question of making our parochial schools free, a very important consideration has been entirely overlooked. I think we ought to stand for the pay schools. The generation now growing up is eventually to be the support of our parishes. In order to be a strong and secure support, the young people must acquire the spirit of sacrifice, which is an essential factor in all religious and moral life, no less than in the life of the Church.

"It can be acquired only if the germ is implanted early in youth and carefully trained. Instruction alone will not suffice for this end. We must teach the children and let them do. If a child brings its pennies to school from month to month and hands them to the Sister, this is practical instruction to the effect: Child, you must support the Catholic school. If the child learns this lesson through six or eight years, it will later on easily learn to do his duty towards the Church. For this reason I, for my part, induce the children to bring me a penny each Monday for twenty-five consecutive weeks, for the Indian missions. For the same reason I exhort Catholic parents, when they desire to have a mass said for the dead, to send the stipend through their children. In this way the children accustom themselves to perform deeds of charity, and the parents may rest assured that if they depart this life, their children will continue to support church and school. 'Jung gewohnt, alt gethan,' as the German proverb has it. As soon as my school children begin to earn money, they willingly contribute their mite towards the fund for a new church building. Even school children offer to contribute from their savings. Thus they grow into the fulfilment of their duties, as it were, and while I hear many confratres complain that their young people will do nothing for church and school, I must say that but few of mine shirk their duty.

"If children are trained without knowledge of the fact that a school must be supported, if they are taught free, and even get their books for nothing, they will naturally expect to receive the services of the Church free of charge all through life. And why should they not? They have not learned to make sacrifices as minors, they will not make them after they have become of age. 'Was Hänschen nicht lernt, lernt Hans nimmermehr.'

"To me this pedagogical reason seems to settle the question in favor of pay schools, and I must say that, after practising this system for many years, I have excellent results."

This is truly an "important consideration," but it has not been "entirely overlooked." Reference to vol. x, No. 43, of THE REVIEW, will show that it has been strongly brought forward by Father Decker of Milwaukee and, if not refuted, at least shown to be weak by another writer.

"To say the least," wrote Rev. J. F. Meifuss, "that argument is weak. The money required to secure free schools opens up a

channel for the spirit of sacrifice that neither the present nor the next generation will fill. And if after two generations our schools would be practically endowed, would there be no field left for generosity? Besides maintaining church and pastor, are there no general Catholic needs towards which the generosity of Catholics might be directed? What about the missions among the Indians and negroes and to non-Catholics? What about the Holy Childhood and Propagation of the Faith, where American Catholics have hitherto made such a poor showing? What about the Peter Claver societies for the suppression of slavery? What—last not least—about the need of a Catholic daily press? It seems to us there is no cause for uneasiness on this score. We are far from having sufficient endowments for our schools, and when we have obtained them, a vast field will still be open to cultivate the spirit of sacrifice, a spirit decidedly more Catholic than the one so largely prevailing at present, which embraces only the petty interests within the shadow of the parish steeple." (THE REVIEW, x, 43, p. 678.)

On the whole, of course, the question: Free schools or pay schools? can not now be settled definitively and categorically. There are doubtless localities where, for the present, it is wise to adhere to the old system. But we honestly believe that in the long run the only thing that will save our Catholic parish schools, or at least the only effective means of extending their benefits to the greatest possible number, will be to make them free schools in the sense that no tuition fees will be demanded.

The Promised Revision of the Roman Breviary is awaited with interest in many quarters. Liturgical students will naturally welcome the proposed return to the weekly recitation of the Psalter, a primitive practice that has long been rendered obsolete by the portentous increase of the Officia Sanctorum. But any drastic changes in the structure of the Divine Office would certainly be regarded by many with regret or misgiving.

One of the chief features in this revision will be the elimination of historical errors from the lives of the Saints and other Breviary lessons. Something had already been done in this direction in the days of Pope Leo. Thus, the fabled fall of St. Marcellinus has disappeared from the pages of the Breviary. And, oddly enough, the story told in the older office is now branded as a calumny in the newer editions. Among the fables that have shared the same fate is the gruesome legend of Constantine's leprosy and the projected bath of blood, and the Emperor's baptism by Pope Sylvester. But this story has been dismissed in a milder manner. And it has left behind some traces of its presence in the pages of the Breviary.

When once this process of revision has been begun, it is obvious that it must needs be carried on to completion. Else it would surely have been a safer course to leave the old legends in undisturbed possession. For when some of the Breviary lessons have been carefully corrected by the light of recent evidence, the reader will naturally be more ready to regard the rest as historical. But such passages as the life of the Areopagite, or the pagan fable of Hippolytus, or the voyage of Magdalen and Martha to Marseilles have clearly no claim to be treated as serious history.

The *Tablet* (No. 3335), from whose columns the above is taken, expresses the hope that the revisers will also pay due attention to certain inaccuracies in the matter of literary history. Apart from its chief function as a book of public prayer, the Roman Breviary may be regarded as a rich store-house of patristic literature, which is happily in the hands of many who have little scope for more extensive studies in the pages of the Fathers. But the value of the book in this way is considerably lessened by the fact that it contains many passages from doubtful or spurious writings. Some of these, it is true, have beauties of their own; and there is no reason to object to their retention. But, is it too much to ask for a more accurate indication of the age and authorship of these writings? Why should extracts from works of dubious origin bear the great names of Ambrose, or Augustine, or Gregory Nazianzen?

What has been said of the Breviary will obviously apply to the larger literature of popular devotion. And many lives of the Saints and other pious manuals would be none the worse for a searching historical revision. It is true, indeed, that pious legends have a legitimate place of their own: if only they are not allowed to pass for history. The most rigid critical historian need have no quarrel with writers of historical romance, so long as they appear in their true colors.

More Catholic Free Schools.—An esteemed reader writes: A parochial free school was established in the Annunciation parish, Williamsport, Pa., in 1878. Over 400 children were enrolled on the opening day, leaving scarcely a baker's dozen in the public school. It was supported by the Sunday plate collections, which rose from $8 to $30 a Sunday. There was never any trouble in supporting the school, of which the people were justly proud.

A pay school or academy existed in Pittston, Pa., since 1860. In time a large parochial free school was built, dependent for its existence upon the academy; that is, the sisters from their earnings in the academy furnished eight teachers for the parochial school free of charge to the congregation. In a country like ours such a system was foredoomed. It introduced envy and bickerings between the two classes of children, and as soon as the people began to realize that it was a poor school rather than a free school, its prosperity was at an end. In 1899, the select academy was discontinued. The schools were all made free, and children were promoted according to their merit—from the lowest room in the parochial school on up, to the highest in the academy.

These schools are now very flourishing, with over 800 pupils. The Sunday plate collection rose from $20 to $40 a Sunday, which, together with an annual income from a legacy left by a former pastor, is amply sufficient to meet all expenses. The people could not be induced to return to the old system or to support it.

The Motu Proprio on the Codification of Canon Law bears the date of March 19th, 1904. The future Code of Pius X. will be the first complete and systematic codification of the laws of the Church. All the other pontiffs mentioned in the Motu Proprio have made collections—they have not codified. The work of codification now undertaken will be fourfold: 1. The complete abolition of all the

unnecessary, obsolete, imperfect, antiquated legislation which has drifted down through centuries to the Universal Church or to any parts of the Universal Church; 2. The creation of such new statutes as may be required throughout the Church to-day; 3. The systematic arrangement of the entire body of Canon Law, so that it will be possible for any intelligent person to put his finger at once on the special canon which treats of any particular question; and 4. The extension of the general code of Canon Law to all parts of the Church—this following as a natural consequence from the abolition of merely local laws.

It is hardly necessary to add that for the execution of his scheme of codification the Holy Father will require the assistance of the whole hierarchy of the Church and the study of theologians in all parts of the world—as well as of the cardinalitial commission which he has just appointed.

Church and State in the Republic of Panama.—According to information from most trustworthy sources, *Razón y Fe* states (No. xxxii, page 550) that 1. The ecclesiastical corporations in Panama, although figuring, against their will, on the list of invitations to the assembly in which independence was proclaimed, did not partake in it; 2. The clergy followed throughout the example of their bishop in this delicate matter; 3. What seemed to be originally only a political transformation, will gradually turn out to be a crisis of the good religious spirit which has so far prevailed in Panama and did not seem to be lacking in the majority of those who worked for independence; 4. The Constitutional Assembly is ruled by a Liberal sectarian majority, who have established liberty of religions and bitterly fight for the total exclusion of religion from the elementary schools, the abolishment of oaths, and general adoption of the Liberal program.

We hope the Catholics of Panama will not follow the example of the French, waiting and praying for victory, whilst scarcely any one moves a hand or foot to fight the enemy.

——We have the following letter, dated May 7th, from His Grace the Archbishop of Milwaukee:

"At the end of the topic on 'Our Status in Church Music,' in the last number of THE REVIEW, page 285, you say that our archbishops at their late conference in Washington, resolved to have Card. Gibbons send a statement of the Church music situation to Rome, with a request to modify some of the more severe rulings of the Motu proprio for the United States. In as much as this statement—*entirely false*—is due to an interview of mine not accurately reported in many newspapers, I desire to give it the widest correction. Cardinal Gibbons was not instructed to request the Holy See for any modifications whatever. The archbishops were of one mind that the Pope's orders should be carried out wherever possible. In regard to places where it would be impossible to introduce all the proposed reforms in Church music at once, the suggestion was made to explain our situation to the Holy Father. However, the archbishops considered it more advisable to simply await further instructions (not modifications) from Rome, which would be undoubtedly forthcoming before

long in answer to the inquiries being sent there at this very hour from many parts of the Church. Sincerely yours,

† S. G. MESSMER."

——Quite recently, the ex-reverend Thomas Hagerty was announced to deliver a lecture at Marion, Ind., under the auspices of the local trades council. On the initiative of the Knights of Columbus a meeting of the men of St. Paul's church was held in the council's rooms on April 17th and a general protest voiced against the lecturer using the title "Rev. Father" Hagerty. It was the prevailing sentiment that any support given him would be offensive to the Catholics of Marion. He was a renegade, a priest false to his vows, an advocate of principles reprobated by the Church, and his presence in the city, harbored by an association of which many of them were members, was an insult to them. The committee appointed to confer with the trades council was received most courteously and on its representations the lecture was immediately cancelled. If the example of Marion were followed elsewhere, the McGradys, Delaneys, and others of their ilk would soon be driven out of the lecture field.—*Catholic Columbian* (xxix, 18).

——M. Pierre de Coubertin, in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, in which he traces something of the history of that French colony in America which Napoleon sold to the United States, shows with what incredible ignorance, indifference, and selfishness France treated her American colonists. It is a sad story of neglect and abuse. Secretary Taft, in speaking for the President at the opening of our World's Fair, April 30th, affirmed that we in the Philippines were going to show how a central government could be generous to a distant dependency. But he is a living witness that, thus far at least, we have run the same old sorrowful course. His advice, his arguments, his appeals have been rejected as contemptuously by the American Congress as were ever those of an Iberville or a Vaudreuil by a preoccupied and scornful ministry in Paris.

——It is apt to console us for much of the abuse to which we are subjected at home, to see our humble REVIEW referred to in the great Roman *Civiltà Cattolica*, which stands so close to the Holy Father himself, as a "periodico settimanale pubblicato a St. Louis dal dotto e ben informato Sig. Arturo Preuss" (quaderno 1291, 2 aprile 1904, p. 118.) While we certainly do not deserve the epithet of "learned" and can hardly claim to be "well-informed" out-side a comparatively narrow range, we are pleased to see our good will and honest effort recognized by such a competent judge.

——His Excellency Msgr. Falconio, Apostolic Delegate, kindly informs us, under date of May 5th, that "there is no truth in the report that the American archbishops have been called to Rome." As regards his reported trip, His Excellency writes: "I am going to Rome to pay my respects to the new Pope. Please God, I shall sail from New York on the 'Sicilia,' May 31st, and expect to be back to Washington by the end of July." *Bon voyage!*

——In No. 18, p. 286, sixth line from the top, read "sacrificed over $2,500 of his own salary," instead of $25.